



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

aw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY	DOCKET NO.
09/003,325	01/06/98	PARKER	J	D-6524A

ARTHUR G YEAGER
112 W ADAMS ST
SUITE 1305
JACKSONVILLE FL 32202-3853

LM02/0607

EXAMINER

WILSON, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2712

17

DATE MAILED:

06/07/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/003,325

Applicant(s)
Parker et al.

Examiner
Jacqueline Wilson

Group Art Unit
2712



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 20, 2000

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 109-166 is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 109-166 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2712

DETAILED ACTION III

\Claim Objections

1. Claim 126 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In part B, "respective of" should be changed to --respective one of--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 109 recites the limitation "a respective control device" in part B. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 109 recites the limitation "each field of view" in part C. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 110 recites the limitation "each of the control devices" in part G. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 111-117, and 119-120 recites the limitation "of the camera". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2712

Claim 118 recites the limitation "the camera". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 121 recites the limitations "other control devices" and "of the camera". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 122 recites the limitation "other control devices". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 123 recites the limitations "of the camera" and "for the camera". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 124 recites the limitation "any control device". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 125 recites the limitation "a control device". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 126 recites the limitation "each field of view" in part C. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim

Claim 127 recites the limitation "the control devices". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 129 recites the limitation "the zoom perspective". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 134 recites the limitation "one or more control devices". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2712

Claim 137 recites the limitation "automatically selecting audio signals associated with all control devices wherever any control device is identified in step E". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This limitation is vague and needs to be written clearer with respect to claims 126 and 134.

Claim 141 recites the limitation "the control device". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 143 recites the limitation "the other control device". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 144 recites the limitation "a camera". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 145 and 148 recites the limitation "the camera". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 146 and 147 recites the limitation "any control device". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 149 recites the limitation "other control devices". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 150-152 recites the limitation "the control device". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 154 recites the limitation "another control device" and "the other control device". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2712

Claims 155-166 are replete with erratic errors. Applicant is reminded that claim limitations needs to be consistent. Claims 155-166 have 35 U.S.C. 112 problems similar to the previous claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 109, 126, 163 and 166 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Uehara (US 5,917,543).

Regarding Claim 109, Uehara '543 teaches at least one camera (fig. 2, 10A & 10B), an automatic control system (11A, 11B, 32A, 32B, 30A and 30B) for controlling the field of view of at least one camera (such as pan, tilt, zoom, and focus), at least two control devices (34A and 34B; see also fig. 4) being moveable respectively by at least two user (person a and b), associating each of at least two control devices with respective of at least two users at respective locations selected by the respective at least two users (conference room A and B), associating at least one field of view of the at least one camera with a respective control device at a location

Art Unit: 2712

selected by a respective one of at least two users (col. 5, lines 17+), remembering a field of view of at least one camera (referred to as normal state, see fig. 3), issuing a command from one control device of the at least two control devices (col. 5, lines 5+), identifying the control device that issued the command (this feature is inherent since when person a operates the operating device, the camera associated with person b is complying), and automatically moving the field of view of the at least one camera to the field of view remembered and associated with the control device identified col. 6, lines 6+).

In regards to **claims 126 and 163**, see discussion in claims 109.

In regards to **claim 166**, see the discussion in claim 109.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 110-125, 127-137, 141-162, and 164-165 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara (US 5,917,543) and Parker et al. (U.S. 5,471,296).

In regards to **claim 110**, Uehara '543 fails to specifically disclose issuing commands from each of the control devices to remember a field of view position of the camera and remembering

Art Unit: 2712

the control device that issued the respective command. However, Parker teaches an automatic control system (col. 4, lines 23-30) for controlling the field of view of the at least one camera and a control device (18) which is movable independently of the automatic control system and the at least one camera by a user to a selected location that controls the tracking, pan, tilt, etc. (See fig. 14; col. 4, lines 62- col. 5). Parker et al. '296 also discloses remembering the field of views in the remote controller (col. 2, lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to combine Parker et al. '296 in the device of Uehara '543 to improve the functions of the remote controllers, by individually controlling the camera to a predetermined position. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the each of the control devices to remember the field of view and automatically tracking of at least one remote controlling device.

In regards to **claim 111**, see discussion in claim 110. As disclosed in claim 1, the camera can be moved to the different field of view remembered by the remote controller issuing command was discussed above.

In regards to **claim 112**, see discussion in claim 110. Further, obviously when positions of the camera are remembered, it is with respect to a known reference.

In regards to **claim 113**, see discussion in claim 110. Further, as can be seen in controlling the position of camera (Figure 9), both planes can be controlled. Obviously when the position of camera is remembered it is in both directions by Pan and tilt.

In regards to **claim 114**, see discussion in claim 113.

In regards to **claim 115**, see discussion in claims 110 and 113.

Art Unit: 2712

In regards to **claim 58**, Uehara '543 shows remembering the position of the camera in two planes of different positions, and changing positions as controlled, by changing pan, tilt, zoom and focus as discussed above. However, Uehara '543 does not show remembering iris position and iris being controlled. Remembering iris settings and controlling the iris from the remote controller is well known in the art as shown by Parker et al. '296 (col. 9, lines 47+), where the iris along with zoom, focus, pan and tilt are controlled. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to also include the control of iris along with pan, tilt, zoom and focus and also remembering the iris value for different positions as shown by Parker et al. '296, in the remote control device of the video conferencing of Uehara '543, to provide iris control of the camera so that the image to be displayed will be improved.

In regards to **claim 117**, see discussion in claims 110 and 113.

In regards to **claim 118**, see discussion in claims 110 and 113. The operator may change the pan or tilt while maintaining the same zoom perspective.

In regards to **claim 119**, see the discussion in claim 116.

In regards to **claim 120**, see the discussion in claim 116.

Regarding **claim 121**, although not specifically stated, it would have been obvious that in video conferencing system, when another remote user decides to control a local camera, all commands from the previous remote user are overridden so that the present controller may have complete access to the camera functions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

Art Unit: 2712

ordinary skill in the art to issue a command to override subsequent commands from other control devices affecting control of the field of view of the camera.

In regards to **claim 122**, see discussion in claim 111.

In regards to **claim 123**, see discussion in claim 110.

In regards to **claim 124**, see discussion in claim 110. Further, selecting one of the previously stored settings would allow any control device to recall a specific field.

In regards to **claim 125**, see discussion in claim 110. Further, issuing command from a remote controller consistently by giving a new command will provide automatic tracking of the remote control device.

In regards to **claim 127**, see discussion in claim 126.

In regards to **claim 128**, see discussion in claim 126.

In regards to **claim 129**, see discussion in claim 117.

In regards to **claim 130**, see discussion in claim 126. Although not specifically stated, it is notoriously well known in the video conferencing art to enable a user to choose a specific video output signal from a camera to be displayed. (Official Notice)

In regards to **claim 131**, see discussion in claim 126 and 130.

In regards to **claim 132**, see discussion in claim 126.

In regards to **claim 133**, see discussion in claim 126.

In regards to **claim 134**, Uehara '543 discloses a control device for regulating the transmission of video and audio signal (28A and 28B) of a conference (see fig. 3). It would be

Art Unit: 2712

obvious to treat the audio signal in the same manner as the operator selects to transmit and present the corresponding video signal. See also the discussion in claim 126.

In regards to **claim 135**, see discussion in claim 134.

In regards to **claim 136**, see discussion in claim 134.

In regards to **claim 137**, see discussion in claim 134.

In regards to **claim 141**, see the discussion in claim 126.

In regards to **claim 142**, see discussion in claim 110. Further, by the operator continuously selecting pan or tilt would allow for automatic tracking as the command is being continuously executed.

In regards to **claim 143**, see discussion in claims 110. Cessation of command is equivalent to overriding of command.

In regards to **claim 144**, see the discussion in claim 130.

In regards to **claim 145**, see the discussion in claim 131.

In regards to **claim 146**, see the discussion in claim 124.

In regards to **claim 147**, see the discussion in claim 125.

In regards to **claim 148**, see the discussion in claim 121.

In regards to **claim 149**, see the discussion in claim 110 and 121. The operator may select not to override subsequent future commands which allows the other control device to resume issuing commands.

In regards to **claim 150**, see the discussion in claim 110.

Art Unit: 2712

In regards to **claim 151**, see the discussion in claim 110.

In regards to **claim 152**, see the discussion in claim 110.

In regards to **claim 153**, see the discussion in claim 84.

In regards to **claim 154**, as discussed in claim 110, Uehara '543 discloses plural control devices. Each control device allows the operator to command the cameras to pan, tilt, zoom , and provide automatic tracking of the control device. If the conference center comprised plural operators it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to not only provide automatic tracking of the commanding control device but, also provide the option of automatic tracking of the other control device. Offering the operator the user-friendliness of automatic tracking of either the control device or another control device would have provided a great additional benefit.

In regards to **claim 155**, see the discussion in claims 143 and 154.

In regards to **claim 156**, see the discussion in claim 134.

In regards to **claim 157**, see the discussion in claim 135.

In regards to **claim 158**, see the discussion in claim 136

In regards to **claim 159**, see the discussion in claim 142.

In regards to **claim 160**, see the discussion in claim 138.

In regards to **claim 161**, see the discussion in claim 135.

In regards to **claim 162**, see the discussion in claim 137.

Art Unit: 2712

In regards to **claim 162**, see the discussion in claim 110.

In regards to **claim 164**, see the discussion in claim 110.

In regards to **claim 165**, see the discussion in claim 110.

8. Claims 138-140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara '543 and Parker et al. '296, and in further view of Sano et al.

In regards to **claim 138**, Uehara '543 discloses the video conference center for selectively transmitting several camera fields and associated audio. However, Uehara '543 does not explicitly disclose the use of three or more conference sites. Sano does disclose the use of three or more conference sites (Abstract). Allowing more participants to video conference at one time would have been a desirable feature of the video conference. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide multiple conference sites and control devices for the video conference. See also the discussion in claims 110 and 135.

In regards to **claim 139**, see the discussion in claim 138.

In regards to **claim 140**, see the discussion in claim 138.

Art Unit: 2712

Conclusion

9. Any inquiries concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to **Jacqueline Wilson** whose telephone number is (703) 308-5080. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wendy Garber**, can be reached at (703) 305-4929. The fax number for this group is (703) 308-5359.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or Faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communication intended for entry)

or:


(703) 308-5359, (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, V.A., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

JBW

October 8, 1999


Wendy Garber
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2700